

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 11, and 12 are independent. Claims 19-20 have been added. In light of the remarks contained herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13-14, and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Allen et al.* (USP 5,233,689); and rejected claims 5, 7, 9, 12, 15, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Allen et al.* in view of *Solhjell et al.* (USP 5,375,245). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In support of the Examiner's rejection of claim 1, the Examiner asserts that *Allen et al.* discloses an image display system including at least one display device 10 connected to a host device 14 for displaying an image outputted from the host, citing to col. 2, lines 45-50, col. 3, lines 9-14, and Fig. 1, wherein at least one display device monitors a state of coupling with the host device, citing to col. 2, lines 59-67 and col. 3, lines 1-27. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of this reference.

The disclosure as set forth in Allen et al. is directed to a communication circuit having network connection detection capability. As shown in Fig. 1, a laptop computer 10 is coupled to a desktop computer 14. An interface circuit of laptop 10 includes line interface circuits where each one interface circuit monitors an RS-232 line to determine the status of the respective line (col. 2, line 59 - col. 3, line 1).

Computer system 10 can use the Invalid signal to indicate to the user whether or not the computer system 10 is connected to an active network. A communication interface circuit is additionally provided, which detects, at the receiver input, when it is not coupled to another active communications system. When there is no coupling, the communication interface circuit provides a signal so that the application of power to certain portions of the circuitry can be suspended (col. 5, lines 13-24).

In contrast, the present invention as set forth in claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an image display system comprising at least one display device connected to a host device, wherein the at least one display device monitors a state of coupling with the host device. It is respectfully submitted that Allen et al. discloses laptop 10 including interface circuit 20 for determining the status of the respective line. However, Allen et al. fails to teach or suggest the at least one display device monitoring a state of

Arg #2
coupling with the host device as recited in claim 1. As such, claim 1 is not anticipated by *Allen et al.*

Additionally, the Examiner asserts that *Allen et al.* discloses an image display system wherein an image is displayed on the at least one display device in accordance with an image signal which is output from the host device, citing to col. 2, lines 45-50 and col. 3, lines 9-14. The Examiner further cites to Fig. 1. Applicants disagree that *Allen et al.* discloses this feature.

Arg #3
While, as depicted in Fig. 1, *Allen et al.* discloses a laptop 10 coupled to a desktop computer 14 by an RS-232 line 12, there is no teaching or suggestion in *Allen et al.* that is directed to an image being displayed on the at least one display device in accordance with an image signal which is output from the host device. As such, for at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated by *Allen et al.*

It is respectfully submitted that claims 2-3 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1 at least based upon their dependency on claim 1.

Arg
It is further respectfully submitted that claims 4, 10, and 11 contain elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1 and, thus, claims 4, 10, and 11, together with claims dependent thereon, are not anticipated by *Allen et al.*

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

AO
In support of the Examiner's rejection of claim 5, the Examiner asserts that *Solhjell et al.* teaches that the coupling state of the monitor 3 with the computer unit 1 is determined based on synchronization clock signals detected by the synchronization pulse detector. The Examiner concludes it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of *Allen et al.* with the teachings of *Solhjell et al.* to teach the invention as set forth in claim 5. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of the reference and further disagree with the Examiner's combination of the teachings of the references as asserted.

In order to sustain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner must meet his burden to establish a *prima facie* case. "To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations." *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Assuming, *arguendo*, that *Solhjell et al.* teaches determining the coupling state of the monitor with the computer unit based on the synchronization clock signal detected by the synchronization pulse detector, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not equate a data enabled signal with a data transfer clock signal. It is further respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the teaching of one, assuming, *arguendo*, that the references teach what is asserted by the Examiner, will not assume the teachings of the other, namely that the state of coupling is determined based on a data transfer clock signal which is output from the host device. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Additionally, based upon the Examiner's failure to provide a reference that teaches or suggests all of the claimed elements, namely determining a state of coupling with the host device based on a data transfer clock signal which is output from the host device, the Examiner has failed to establish *prima facie* obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103. As such, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that claims dependent on claim 5 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 5 at least based upon their dependency on claim 5.


Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet (Reg. No. 52,327) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
Charles Gorenstein, #29,271

Com
CG/CMV/jdm
0717-0469P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

(Rev. 09/30/03)